

administration is its mad spending spree at the expense of the taxpayers of the nation. The resources of our people are not inexhaustible, yet the government is engaged in a spending program that has enraged Canadians. They are enraged because of the magnitude and the nature of many of the projects. In the past the government finally reached the conclusion that it had been less than successful, to put it rather mildly, and has decided to endeavour to put in place other programs that will work more effectively and efficiently in meeting its goals and objectives.

I fully realize that some of the programs we have had in the past, some of which the government has already indicated are to go by the boards, were created to meet certain critical situations and problems. But instead of defusing those issues and problems we find that the government has created others, some of similar and some of greater magnitude.

I must say that some of the programs have brought some benefits to the Canadian people. I think particularly of the Local Initiatives Program. It was a horrible mess at first but as time went on, after the government listened to some of the suggestions made by some of the people in the various communities, some effective and efficient work was accomplished. We find, however, in the over-all picture that these programs have not been adequate to meet the need, and therefore the government has indicated its intention to replace them with other types of programs.

The government had been making noises about reducing government expenditures, but actually these have only been noises. The estimates which are tabled from time to time indicate a substantial increase in expenditures over the previous year. Certainly this does not appear to fit in with the government's proposal for a reduction in expenditures. We admit there may be a reduction in the amount the government had intended to spend, that it had programmed, or that the departmental officials and ministers had asked be allocated to their departments, but that is a far different story than a reduction in expenditures as viewed by the Canadian people.

When we think of this particular issue I say that the people of Canada have placed almost in the number one slot government expenditures as something that has created a great deal of distrust and resentment right across the nation. It has been placed on the record that the habits of the government are so excessive that its spending has practically quadrupled in the last ten years. One of my colleagues pointed out that it took the government 100 years to reach a budget level of \$9.9 billion in 1967, that this administration doubled that figure in the next three years, and in the last four years doubled it again to the present \$42 billion spending estimates we have before parliament. So we see just how far we have gone and the extent to which the government has increased the expenditures of this country.

One of the main concerns of the official opposition on the matter of restraint is that when we look at the proposal before us we see that it is too little too late. I should like to point out that in 1965 the total government share of the Gross National Product was 30.3 per cent. In 1974 the total government share

of the Gross National Product had risen to 40.4 per cent. In other words, over the period of a decade the government's share of the Gross National Product had increased by one third. It is granted that there are many factors which lead to inflation but I believe it is recognized and acknowledged by authorities from coast to coast and in various parts of the world that unreasoned government expenditure is by far the most serious factor in the inflationary cycle.

I should like to refer to an editorial by Mr. Edward Belitsky, Editor of the *Canadian Automotive Trade* magazine. Talking about the tax-hungry government he said:

Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau is running the federal government very much as Jean Drapeau is running the Olympics. The money we sink into it seems to be disappearing at an ever-increasing rate.

That is the first paragraph. The concluding paragraph of the editorial states:

Every time the minister of finance or head of the treasury board or any one of Trudeau's other torpedoes goes on TV to tell us the latest bad news regarding taxes, budgets or whatever else is currently amiss, we get the feeling that the country is being run like the world's biggest protection racket.

We can understand something of the feelings of the Canadian people when we consider some of these quotations and references I have brought to the attention of the members of the House.

I should like to refer to some of the make-work programs the government has indicated will be eliminated, and the reason given. Surely when the government frantically tries to put in place programs to give people work there must be some reason for this, and some objective the government has in mind. I suggest the reason for so many make-work programs is the government's bungling and ineptitude in providing leadership for the nation. The responsibility of the government is not to provide jobs but rather to create the economic climate in which private enterprise can work to its full potential in utilizing the human resources of the nation in productive and remunerative employment. I suggest this is something the government has failed dismally to accomplish. I say the opposite is true.

Restrictions, undue interference, and confiscatory taxation have all tended to undermine initiative, limit development, and undermine the will to succeed in chosen fields of endeavour. I believe this is the reason why the government has so readily resorted to make-work programs in order to try to pick up the slack. I refer to the government's bungling and ineptitude in creating the climate conducive to a developed and orderly policy in our nation.

We recall that some time ago the Prime Minister stated that the free enterprise system in Canada had failed and that the result would be greater government involvement and interference. There was quite a reaction to that statement, as we know. It came from the business community. It came not only from the larger business area but also from the small business community and from a great many organizations and agencies, as well as from individuals right across the nation.